

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated July 8, 2004 (application Paper No. 7), the Examiner requested another set of Formal Drawings (the prior set having been damaged during the mailing process), and rejected all pending claims under 35 USC § 103(a). In response, applicants are sending another set of drawings with this response, and the Examiner's various rejections of the claims will be discussed below in the order they appear in the Office action.

***35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claims 1-4, 6-17***

The Examiner first rejected claims 1-4 and 6-17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,457,047 (Chandra et al.). In particular, the Examiner cited Chandra et al. as teaching “a topology cache”, citing element 26 of FIG. 1 and the description at column 4, lines 7-49, with the “topology cache” cited as including the “lists of application cache lists”, and “storing the topology cache at each server”.

Upon review of FIG. 1 and the cited column 4, applicants cannot find any teaching of a “topology cache”, nor is term “topology” found in Chandra et al. Indeed, applicants assert that Chandra et al. describes an arrangement where various applications are stored at different servers, but the *topology per se* is not “generated” or “stored” as defined by independent claim 1. Indeed, applicants have amended claim 1 to further define the term “topology” as meaning “the forest-structured, distributed topology of the directory servers”. No such discussion or description is found in the cited Chandra et al. reference. Chandra et al. is directed to caching queries so as to more rapidly respond to incoming queries. The “cache directory server 30” of Chandra et al., as defined at column 4, beginning at line 43, is “connected to the network [and] keeps track of the

status (what service has been cached on what servers) of all the application cache servers on the network". No "topology" information is stored at "cache directory server 30", much less distributed to each server in the network.

Based on these significant differences and the lack of teaching regarding "topology"-based information in Chandra et al., applicants assert that Chandra et al. cannot be found to render obvious the subject matter of the present invention as defined by independent claim 1 (amended only to clarify the definition of "topology", not to overcome Chandra), or claims 2-4 and 6-17, which depend therefrom. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claims 1-4 and 6-17 to be in condition for allowance.

### ***35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claim 5***

Lastly, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandra et al., when considered with US Patent 6,490,589 (Weider et al.), where Weider et al. was cited by the Examiner as teaching the use of an LDAP query. Regardless of the teaching of Weider et al., applicants assert that Chandra et al. lacks the basic teaching of the subject matter of the present invention regarding the generation of the server topology and distribution of the same to all servers in the network, as defined by claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claim 5 to be in condition for allowance.

In summary, the present application contains claims 1-17, where claim 1 has been amended only to clarify the definition of the term "topology". Another set of Formal Drawings is also being included with this response, as requested by the Examiner. Applicants believe that the case, in its present form, is in condition for allowance over the cited references and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections and find the claims to be allowable. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not agree

that the case is ready to issue and that an interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Sihem Amer-Yahia et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba  
Wendy W. Koba  
Reg. No. 30509  
Attorney for applicants  
610-346-7112

Date: 10/5/2004